



"Promoting consumer
choice and innovation
through advanced
facilities-based networks."

BRINGING FULLY COMPETITIVE BROADBAND TO AMERICA¹

March 3, 2006

FILED ELECTRONICALLY

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: *Ex Parte* Presentation in MB Docket No. 05-311

Dear Ms. Dortch:

Pursuant to Section 1.1206 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. § 1.1206, the Broadband Service Providers Association (BSPA) submits this notice of an *ex parte* presentation in the above-captioned proceeding.

On March 1, 2006, Felix Boccucci, Vice President, Business Development of Knology, Inc., BSPA's counsel, Martin L. Stern, and I, had meetings on behalf of BSPA with Rudy Brioché, Legal Advisor to Commissioner Adelstein and Andrew Long, Acting Legal Advisor to Commissioner Tate, to discuss the Commission's rulemaking on cable franchise-related issues. On March 2, 2006, Mr. Boccucci and I also had meetings with Heather Dixon, Legal Advisor to Chairman Martin and Jordan Goldstein, Legal Advisor to Commissioner Copps.

At these meetings, Mr. Boccucci provided background information on Knology and its efforts to obtain a cable television franchise from the City of Louisville, Kentucky. Mr. Boccucci discussed the impact of a "level playing field"(LPF) provision included in the Louisville cable franchise held by the incumbent cable operator, Insight Communications, and the associated litigation related to Knology's efforts to enter the Louisville market. Mr. Boccucci also provided the attached overview document on Knology, and a copy of his declaration filed in this proceeding on behalf of the Fiber-to-the-Home Council.

¹ The current members of BSPA, all of which are last-mile, facilities-based providers, are: Everest Connections, Knology, Sigecom Communications, PrairieWave Communications, and SureWest Communications. BSPA is located at 1735 New York Avenue, Suite 500, Washington, DC 20006. Phone: 202.661.3945 Fax: 202.347.3457

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary

March 3, 2006

Page 2

In addition, we discussed that any franchising relief must apply equally to existing competitive franchises, and discussed other franchising provisions of concern, beyond LPF provisions, as summarized in the attached handout.

Respectfully submitted,

**BROADBAND SERVICE PROVIDERS
ASSOCIATION**

By: _____/s/_____
John Goodman, Executive Director
1735 New York Ave., N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 661-3945

Enclosures

cc: Heather Dixon
Jordan Goldstein
Rudy Brioche
Andrew Long

Broadband Service Providers Association - Franchise Reform Summary Position

- Franchising reform needs to address all market positions that bring competition and consumer choice. These include:
 - Competitors that want to upgrade existing networks.
 - Existing operators that already have competitive franchises.
 - Competitors that want to build new networks or network extensions without regard to technology deployed.

Any cable franchising relief should not be contingent on prior presence in the right of way or use of IP technology, and it should apply to existing competitive franchises.

- So-called "level playing field" requirements have resulted in new competitors being assessed with the "exact same" requirements as incumbents but often collected as upfront fees. This is unfair economic burden for two reasons:
 - New competitors have no customer base to fund these requirements.
 - Many requirements were formulated when the incumbent was the only game in town. Requiring competitors to fulfill catch up on these requirements results in cities being compensated with excess funds from diverted capital.
 - All operators should be assessed the same per subscriber requirements.
- LPF buildout requirements are a barrier to the entry of new network construction.
 - Fears of "redlining" are overstated.
 - New network builds are driven by cost and density not demographics.
 - The upgrade of existing networks should have its own buildout metrics.
- The root problem for new entrants obtaining franchises in a timely fashion is the negotiation process where LFAs seek to maximize the amount of financial contribution they can extract for the issuance of a franchise.
 - Benchmark franchises negotiated in the 90's are not sustainable models. They were created in the environment of "Irrational Exuberance".
 - Negotiation processes are materially affected by threat of lawsuit.
 - Franchise related obligations need clear boundaries.
- Institutional network provisions have turned into an excessive ask for cities.
 - INET support should be limited to dark fiber deployed in open trenches and network connections dropped to the walls of municipal buildings.
 - Other requests for INET support should be netted against franchise fees.
- Support for PEG should be maintained with caps and clearer definitions regarding the financial or other obligations.
 - Monetary PEG support should be netted against franchise fees.
 - In the alternative, these should be capped at .05 per customer per month or .60 per customer per year and video service providers should be able to collect and remit this amount. These fees should not have to be funded from operations.
 - The number of PEG channels should be capped based on the number of subscribers in a franchise. 50-100,000 subs: 2 PEG channels; 100,000 - 500,000 subs 3 PEG channels, etc.

**Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, DC**

In the Matter of)	
)	
Implementation of Section 621(a)(1) of the Cable)	
Communications Policy Act of 1984 as amended)	MB Docket No. 05-311
by the Cable Television Consumer Protection and)	
Competition Act of 1992)	

**DECLARATION OF FELIX BOCCUCCI, JR.
VICE PRESIDENT BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT
KNOLOGY, INC.**

**Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, DC**

In the Matter of)	
)	
Implementation of Section 621(a)(1) of the Cable)	
Communications Policy Act of 1984 as amended)	MB Docket No. 05-311
by the Cable Television Consumer Protection and)	
Competition Act of 1992)	

**DECLARATION OF FELIX BOCCUCCI, JR.
SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT
KNOLOGY, INC.**

I, Felix Boccucci, Jr. do hereby declare, under penalty of perjury, that the following is true and correct to the best of my knowledge:

1. My name is Felix Boccucci, Jr. I am Vice President, Business Development at Knology, Inc. ("Knology"). My business address is 1241 O.G. Skinner Drive, West Point, GA 31833.

2. Knology is a fully integrated provider of video, voice, and data and advanced communications services to residential and business customers in nine markets in the southeastern United States. These include: Huntsville and Montgomery, Alabama; Panama City and a portion of Pinellas County, Florida; Augusta, Columbus, and West Point, Georgia; Charleston, South Carolina; and Knoxville, Tennessee. In each of these markets, Knology competes against incumbent cable and telephone entities.

3. Knology's general network topology is hybrid fiber-coax, although it has constructed a fiber-to-the-curb network in Knoxville. All video and data services are provided

over Knology's network. For voice services, most are provided over our own network, and a minimal amount is provided off-net.

4. Knology's networks pass 955,497 homes, of which 747,776 are considered marketable (without exclusive arrangements). As of September 30, 2005, Knology had 175,294 video connections, almost 150,000 voice connections, and over 100,000 data connections.

5. In my capacity as Vice President, Business Development and in previous positions, I have overseen all activities related to Knology's efforts to obtain cable television franchises. These activities began in 1995, and today, Knology has over 70 franchises. Of these, over 50 were obtained by applying for initial franchises, and the remainder was obtained when we acquired other companies.

6. In my experience, the nature of the franchise process differs greatly depending on the community. In most major markets, the process is time-consuming, laborious, and expensive. This is due to the fact that these municipalities have greater resources to expend, more political and government entities and community groups that become involved and an incumbent cable operator with more at stake. In many smaller communities, because they have fewer competitive service choices, Knology's entry was welcomed, and the processes moved quicker with few onerous provisions included in the agreements.

7. From a new entrant's standpoint, there are many franchise provisions or processes resulting in entry being delayed or deployment slowed. I will highlight some of them.

8. The first barrier is the so-called "parity" or "level playing field" ("LPF") provision, which requires the new entrant to accept all of the responsibilities and obligations of the incumbent cable operator. This provision is more aptly called the "anti-competition"

provision. Its superficial appeal to fairness masks the real intent: to protect the incumbent's market position. No new entrant – without any market share – can be viable if it must undertake the same responsibilities and obligations of an incumbent with market power.

9. As part of the “parity” mentality, municipalities frequently consult with the incumbent cable operator about the terms of the new entrant's franchise agreement. This can only be viewed as per se anticompetitive.

10. Another onerous provision is the requirement that the new entrants construct its network to the same locations and in the same amount of time as the incumbent did originally. This is the so-called “buildout” requirement. The incumbent's construction, however, was a “typical greenfield” build without any other cable provider in the market. In contrast, the new entrant cannot expect to obtain the same degree of market penetration in the same amount of time. Adhering to the same buildout requirements is economic suicide and creates significant financing issues since investors require a fair rate of return on their investment. The majority of Knology's franchise require the buildout of the same franchise area as the incumbent rather than allowing the new applicant to define its own franchise area (without income-based redlining). This creates undue economic burden because in some areas, for example, the density of residences is low enough that you cannot justify the additional capital investment to build in those areas and compete with the incumbent.

11. The very time it takes to obtain a franchise also can be a barrier to entry. There is no reason the process cannot be completed within four months at most. That was Knology's experience in many smaller markets. When the process is extended beyond this amount of time, the cost of entry increases significantly.

12. A short term of duration for the franchise also amounts to an unfair burden. Given the time required to construct a network plant and then take market share from the incumbent, a term of ten years or less is a deterrent to entering a market.

13. Finally, there are all the requirements outside the statute that are imposed on new entrants. These range from grants to education or government entities to special fees. Often, Knology was required to pay these fees upon entering into the franchise agreement, rather than having them distributed as the network was constructed and customers acquired.

14. Any one of these barriers has the affect of slowing entry, and they may even halt entry entirely, especially when they occur in combination. To gain greater insight into these barriers, I will provide examples of several of Knology's efforts to obtain franchises.

15. Knology approached the City of Louisville, Kentucky in early 2000 and applied to obtain a cable television franchise. Knology believed this market to be an excellent opportunity because it believed the incumbent provider's (Insight's) network and operations lagged behind industry norm. If it could enter quickly on competitively favorable terms, it believed it could, by offering more services at better prices, capture a large share of the customer base.

16. The initial informal discussions with the city were promising, but, because the incumbent cable provider's agreement had a LPF provision, the negotiations quickly became much more complicated. The city was particularly concerned that it would be sued by Insight, which would be a costly distraction.

17. Because of the LPF provision, the city sought to draft an agreement as identical as possible to the incumbent's. Each time a new draft was produced, the city would

share it with the incumbent. Each time the incumbent would respond with another set of revisions.

18. Four issues were most prominent. First Insight was required to pay the city \$500,000 in five annual installments as part of a settlement arising out of the overcharging of cable customers in the 1980s. As part of the settlement agreement, however, this obligation was also incorporated into Insight's cable franchise. Insight insisted that Knology be required to make the same payments so its franchise would not be "more beneficial" than Insight's. Knology accede to this blatantly unfair demand it had no revenues at all in the 1980s, let alone revenues from customers it had overcharged in order to get a franchise. Knology was to make its first payment at the moment the franchise was granted despite the fact that Knology had neither network nor revenue at that point. Second, Knology sought a 15 year franchise, which was the same duration as the initial franchise of the cable operator that was acquired by Insight. The incumbent argued that the term of the franchise should be 10 years, the same term in its renewed franchise agreement. Third, Insight argued that it was able to rebuild the previous cable operator's network in 15 months, and Knology, despite being a new entrant, should have a similar requirement. Insight also argued that Knology should have additional bonding requirements to cover any cable cuts and should suffer severe penalties if it did not meet the buildout requirements. (Neither of these requirements were in Insight's agreement.) Fourth, Insight alleged Knology was not financially fit, which resulted in the city hiring a consultant to review Knology's financial wherewithal.

19. Because these issues were so contentious, the process dragged on. It was not until September, 2000 that the city approved the franchise by a vote of 7-5. This, however and most unfortunately, was not the end of the process. Insight's agreement permitted it to delay

the implementation of any new franchise until all appeals to the highest court in the state were completed. Thus, began another round of delay as Insight took the city's decision to court.

20. These delays enabled Insight to upgrade its network, improve its operations, and enter into exclusive agreements with owners of multiple development units. As a result, Knology's market opportunity evaporated, and it never entered the Louisville market.


21. In March, 2000, Knology applied for a cable television franchise in the greater Nashville, Tennessee area (Davidson County). Here too, the franchising process proved to be lengthy, laborious, and expensive. It was not until October, 2000 that the franchise was approved and Knology had spent approximately \$500,000 in the process.

22. Once again, a LPF provision was at the heart of the problem. Knology had to agree to the incumbent's obligations without having the incumbent's market power. For instance, it was required to obtain exorbitantly priced letters of credit and make excessive grants putatively for PEG activities including an initial PEG grant payment of \$266,000 at the time of the grant of the franchise. The total PEG grant requirement over the 15 year franchise term equated to an enormous \$1.9 million financial burden. Knology agreed to these requirements because it had no choice if it wanted to operate in Nashville.

23. In contrast to these experiences, Knology had better experiences with franchising authorities in smaller markets, including Autauga County, Prattville, Montgomery County (all in Alabama), and Cedar Grove, Florida. These markets were hungry for competitive choices. Consequently, the process was quicker with Knology obtaining a franchise in most instances in less than 6 months. LPF and buildout requirements were either non-existent or less burdensome. Knology operates successfully in these markets today.

24. In sum, the local franchising process badly needs reform. It is anti-competition and anti-consumer, depriving residents and businesses of the benefits of robust cable competition and hampering the deployment of advanced networks. If LFAs are restrained from insisting on unreasonable requirements unsuitable for new competitors and imposing burdensome financial requirements and required to act on franchise applications in a suitably short time, competitive providers of cable service and advanced broadband services such as Knology, could enter the marketplace quicker and more effectively to the benefit of consumers. Indeed, in 2004 the General Accounting Office concluded that rates for cable services were 15 to 41% lower in markets where a Broadband Service Provider offered services in competition with an incumbent cable provider. Wire Based Competition Benefited Consumers in Selected Markets, GAO-04-241 (February, 2004). For example, today in portions of Pinellas County, Florida, Knology competes with Bright House, the incumbent cable provider. In those areas where Knology competes with Bright House, Bright House's expanded basic service rate is \$10 to \$15 lower than in those areas of the county where Bright House faces no competition from another franchisee. Policymakers should address these problems immediately.

This concludes my declaration.


Felix Boccucci, Jr.

Dated: Feb 19, 2006



KNOLOGY™

Company Overview



- ▶ Knology provides video, high-speed data, and voice services in 9 markets in the Southeastern US
 - Knology had 432,849 connections as of December 31, 2005
 - 175,472 video connections
 - 151,741 voice connections
 - 105,636 high-speed data connections
- ▶ Knology competes against incumbent cable providers and the RBOCs
- ▶ Knology distinguishes itself from its competition by offering a bundle of cable, high-speed data and voice services
 - Knology is scheduled to begin rolling out residential VoIP services in 2006 and believes that it will be the first MSO to offer customers the choice between VoIP and circuit switched telephony


Company Overview (Cont'd)



- ▶ Knology has experienced significant growth, both in its customer base and its revenues
 - Connections have increased at a 29% annual compounded rate over 8 years, growing from approximately 57,000 in 1997 to approximately 433,000 by December 31, 2005
 - Revenues have increased at a 38% annual compounded rate over 8 years, growing from approximately \$18 million in 1997 to approximately \$231 million for 2005
- ▶ Knology management has developed a strong track record by focusing on solid execution and “best in class” customer service and retention
 - As a result, annual Adjusted EBITDA has grown from \$(7.2) million in 2000 to \$47.7 million for 2005

Knology's Concentrated Footprint Coverage is a Key Differentiator with its Competition

KNOLOGY™



Knology Provides Video, High-Speed Data and Voice Services in a Bundled Product Offering

KNOLOGY™

Knology has successfully offered a bundled broadband product for eight years and is the only provider of the triple play bundle in 8 of its 9 markets.

Product Overview

KNOLOGY™

Video

- ▶ Diverse line-up of basic, digital cable and premium video programming – 190 digital channels
- ▶ Video On Demand (VOD), Subscription Video On Demand (SVOD) and Interactive TV (ITV) in selected markets
- ▶ HDTV: 11 to 15 channels (varies by market)
- ▶ Digital Video Recorders (Standard Definition and High Definition)
- ▶ Caller ID on TV and DVR's with DVD recorders coming in 2006

Voice Services

- ▶ Currently circuit-switched in all markets
- ▶ Rolling out VoIP to residential customers beginning in 2006. The Company currently offers IP Services to business customers
- ▶ Full range of local and long-distance calling plans
- ▶ Available as stand-alone product or as part of a 2 or 3-product bundle

Data Services

- ▶ Offer 2 tiers of service
 - IntroNet: available at speeds of 256k providing inexpensive upgrade from dial-up, but slower than typical high speed service
 - 4.0 megabits, or higher, per second high speed Internet
- ▶ Value-added features such as e-mail accounts, on-line storage, spam protection and parental controls

Package Overview

KNOLOGY™

Complete Solution

Everything in the Deluxe Solution, plus:

- ▶ All Premium Channels (HBO, Starz, etc.)
- ▶ All telephone calling features (*SmartChoice*)

Deluxe Solution

Everything in the Standard Solution, plus:

- ▶ Digital Preferred Cable Service
- ▶ One Premium Channel (HBO, Starz, etc.)
- ▶ Choice of three telephone calling features

Standard Solution

Everything in the Economy solution, plus:

- ▶ 4.0 Mbps high speed Internet

Economy Solution

- ▶ E-Basic Cable Service
- ▶ Local Telephone Service
- ▶ 256k High Speed Internet Service (including modem)

Cable & Internet Solution

- ▶ E-Basic Cable Service
- ▶ 4.0 Mbps High Speed Internet (including modem)

Phone & Internet Solution

- ▶ Local Telephone Service
- ▶ 4.0 Mbps High Speed Data Service (including modem)

Cable & Telephone Solution

- ▶ E-Basic Cable Service
- ▶ Local Telephone Service


A la Carte Upgrade Offering

- ▶ Digital Cable Service
- ▶ Unlimited Long Distance
- ▶ Premium Movie Channels
- ▶ HDTV or DVR
- ▶ SportsPak
- ▶ PPV Movies

Overview of Knology Network and Facilities



Fully upgraded interactive broadband network










- ▶ Redundant fiber-optic cable, coaxial cable and copper wire
- ▶ 16,000+ homes per hub
- ▶ 500 homes per node, migratable down to 125 homes per node
- ▶ Designed for growth
- ▶ Proactive network maintenance

Efficient architecture, technically and geographically clustered.

Knology Bundled Offering is a Key Differentiator with its Competition

KNOLOGY™

	Market Overlap	Video	Voice	Data
KNOLOGY™	9	✓	✓	✓
 Comcast	5	✓	–	✓
 Charter	4	✓	–	✓
 TIME WARNER CABLE	1	✓	–	✓
 Mediacom	2	✓	–	✓
 bright house NETWORKS	1	✓	✓	✓
 Bellsouth	7	–	✓	✓
 verizon	1	–	✓	✓
Satellite Providers	9	✓	–	–

✓ = Significant Presence